

## **RAVENNA CREEK DAYLIGHTING PROJECT PUBLIC MEETING**

**DATE:** October 9, 2003

**RECORDER:** Colleen Browne

**REPRESENTED:** 50 people used the sign-in sheets. While affiliation was not requested, representatives from RUG/Little League, women's softball, Ravenna Creek Alliance, upper free area, and RPAC were present. In addition, 16 individuals left written comments. Several people noted that they were attending for the first time.

The new Project Manager introduced herself (Colleen Browne) and explained the process and proposals to date. The new proposals that were presented were formulated in response to feedback at the Open House held on August 19<sup>th</sup> in the park. At that meeting, many people came to complain that they did not want the ballfield moved at any time in the future. They did not want it removed from the Park even if it could be relocated elsewhere in the north end. Their dual complaint, and one received even from people who liked the plan before them, was that it didn't seem like enough bang for the buck and that more daylighting should be possible, even if the field stayed.

Project Manager explained that the funding had changed somewhat. If the city accepts maintenance and operation of the pipeline that Metro is building to take the flow from the edge of the park to Union Bay Slough, it will transfer all the funds currently earmarked (the entire \$1.7 million) to the City for use in the daylighting project, art work associated with both the City's and County's projects, and the future maintenance requirements.

Alternative 1A was presented. This is much like the original Alternative 1. The creek is daylighted to the east of the ballfield, as far as possible, but not all the way to 55<sup>th</sup>. There is an ADA accessible pathway along the current steep hillside, which slopes gently to a raised meadow on the west side. The main issue was the path that goes around the outfield to join up with the main park path. People were concerned that walkers and joggers could be hit. Another concern is that ballplayers retrieving their balls might degrade the nearby habitat.

Alternative 2A was also presented. This is much like the original Alternative 2 that was a favorite last year. The main difference was that the ballfield was scooted toward the eastern edge, but not enough to require retaining walls or excessive tree removal. Ideally, this ballfield would have a minimal outfield, 180 for Little League, or 190 for women's softball. The stream was brought around the west side of the ballfield and closer to the 55<sup>th</sup>. Since the creek needed room to fall, the ballfield was somewhat isolated and had to be accessed on two sides by long bridges, which were fairly high above the water. The creek was fairly narrow and steep, creating somewhat of a ditchlike appearance in places, although it was in view for most park goers. The issues were that the ADA accessibility of the park could not be accomplished (there was no raised meadow area to help bring the path along the steep western side back to current grade more gently) and that the habitat value was less than that of Alternative 1A.

The budgets of each alternative were roughly the same. Either alternative could be done with a 200-foot outfield. In Alternative 1A the entrance, which is a series of earthen "bleachers" is sited to overlook the ballfield. In Alternative 2A, this entryway overlooks a large pond. The entryway is designed to restore the hillside that the three large oaks are planted on. Current shortcuts into the park are causing serious erosion problems near their roots.

**Questions/Comments:**

**How many trees will be removed?** In either scenario, approximately 20 trees (mostly non-natives) are to be removed either because they are in the way, are already deteriorating or will cause damage to the understory plants. Additionally, several native trees will be moved to other locations on site.

**Request:** Bring back the overlook near the meadow.

**Habitat Value of each alternative?** Because people are only accessing one side of the creek in Alternative 1A and the other side is open space/wooded its habitat value is higher than Alternative 2A. Although 2A is not easily accessed by people, it has lots of human activity of either side (ballfield and path), and has steeper slopes.

**Request** that Parks look at having a path on either side of the creek (like the old Alternative 1). Agreed to look at, but note that the habitat value of having people only on one side is important.

**Request** that Parks guarantee that the ballfield will remain at 200 feet. Agreed.

At the end of the discussions attendees were asked to express their preference for the plans presented. A clear majority expressed a preference for Alternative 1A.

Ken Bounds has already seen and approved Alternative 1A, so the project team will pursue that one. Future updates will appear on the website. As the design team gets to final design, there will be a general mailing so people can be assured that their concerns and comments were addressed. If it appears there needs to be another public meeting, Parks is happy to have one.